DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 290 FL 027 341

AUTHOR Sabieh, Christine
TITLE An ELT's Solution to Combat Plagiarism: "Birth" of CALL.
PUB DATE 2002-04-00
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Information Technology and Universities in Asia conference (Bangkok, Thailand, April 3-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen; *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Computer Uses in Education; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Language Teachers; *Plagiarism; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Student Research; Teaching Methods; World Wide Web
IDENTIFIERS *Computer Assisted Language Learning

ABSTRACT

One English-as-a Second-Language professor fought plagiarism using computer assisted language learning (CALL). She succeeded in getting half of her class to write documented research papers free of plagiarism. Although all of the students claimed to know how to avoid plagiarizing, 35 percent presented the work with minor traces of plagiarism. The remaining 15 percent were frustrated by the assignment and presented incomplete papers. This paper shows that the key to combating plagiarism is to provide students with challenging assignments using the computer as the medium and giving them autonomy to design a site. These students learned the basic research steps needed to create an APA research paper. The teacher worked to keep them on task, interested, and involved. She had students follow a five-step plan: provide a challenging assignment, provide clear steps to follow, minimize fear of the computer and of creating a web page, ensure understanding of research steps, and ensure plagiarism awareness. This resulted in clear role definitions for the students, the educator, and the computer. The educator used technology as a partner to create plagiarism awareness, and the students used technology as an aid to consciously eliminate plagiarism in the language learning process. (Contains 36 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

http://www.eal.org/ericcll/releaseform.html

ED 465 290

AN ELT'S SOLUTION TO COMBAT PLAGIARISM: "BIRTH" OF CALL

Dr. Christine Sabieh
Notre Dame University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christine Sabieh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL027341

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

AN ELT'S SOLUTION TO COMBAT PLAGIARISM: "BIRTH" OF CALL

Dr. Christine Sabieh
Notre Dame University

Attempting to combat plagiarism remains a nightmare to many ELT. Sabieh's solution is to fight plagiarism through CAL. She succeeded in getting 50% of her class of 30 to write documented research papers, plagiarism-free. Although all the learners claimed to know how to avoid plagiarizing, 35% presented the work with minor traces of plagiarism. The remaining 15%, frustrated and overwhelmed by the assignment, presented incomplete papers. The purpose of this paper is to show that the key to combating plagiarism is to provide learners with a challenging assignment using the computer as the medium and giving them autonomy to design the site. In accordance with course objectives, the learners learnt the basic research steps needed to create an APA research paper. However, Sabieh acknowledges that many learners tend to take the easy way out. The solution was to find a way to keep the learners' on-task, interested and involved in their work. Sabieh advocates doing this by having learners follow a five-step plan: provide a challenging assignment; provide clear steps to follow; minimize fear of computer and creating the web page; ensure understanding of research steps; and ensure plagiarism awareness. This resulted in clear role definitions for the learners, the educator and the computer. Sabieh concludes that the educator in creating a challenging assignment uses the technology as a partner to create plagiarism awareness and the learners use the technology as an aid to consciously eliminate plagiarism in the language learning process.

Plagiarism, using Heineman and Willis' definition as it appears in their book, *Writing Term Papers*, is described as the "attempt to pass off the ideas or the language of someone else as your own. If you use information, speculation, a full sentence, or even a particularly vivid or unusual phrase that you found in your research, you are absolutely obligated to acknowledge it, normally in a note, as clearly and specifically as possible" (1988, p. 57).

So why, as Leland (2002) stated, is it that "plagiarism is a perennial temptation for students and an eternal challenge for teachers"? I believe Hinchliffe (1998) reiterated what most educators in their endeavor to teach and learners in their quest to learn feel when confronted with the word "plagiarism"; according to her, it is "a difficult concept to define ... since it includes a range of actions from failure to use proper citation to wholesale cheating" (Hinchliffe, 1998, p. 1). This endeavor for the educators has become much more challenging with the presence and influence of technology.

Attempting to combat plagiarism has remained a nightmare to many English language educators. The question to answer is "why is this so?" Is it not true that learners have been cutting and pasting—a basic procedure beginning practices since early childhood education? Why is it that the educators and education administrators condemn the practice when learners, from an early age, where introduced to the act and have mastered the art of cutting and pasting so well?

Renard (2000) voiced that such an act was "marvelous", yet at the same time "frightening" She described the act of cutting and pasting as a contrast that provided an unhealthy ground for practice. She said that "as marvelous as such efficiency is, the words cut and paste now also represent a frighteningly easy method to plagiarize work"

(p. 1). The problem is that learners may have become masters of a tool and many use it, effectively, as a means to short cut their learning objectives. Educators are aware that many learners today use it to cut corners in their varied educational assignments.

Hinchliffe (1998) believed that learners "who plagiarize may do so unintentionally or with planful deliberation" (p. 1). She divided plagiarizing groups into two whereas Renard (2000) classified learners as unintentional cheaters, sneaky cheaters, and all-or-nothing cheaters. Harris (2002) classified plagiarizers based on the reason that caused the act to take place. He believed it was important to understand why a learner would resort to plagiarizing and deal with strategies to overcome the act. He classified the learners as natural economizers, as poor time managers and skill planners, choice makers, inadequate writers, and/or thrill seekers.

I believe the educator is expected to combat the act of plagiarism on four levels. The English language teacher (ELT) is expected to combat laziness: the learners who try to find the easy way out of work; the ELT is expected to combat language barriers: the difficulties learners face in acquire, in becoming fluent, and in mastering the second language or foreign language. Moreover, the ELT is expected to combat incorrect application of research steps to do research papers since the learners have not internalized the understanding of each step in the research process as taught in class. Likewise, the ELT is expected to combat the definitive concept of time: The demands put on the learners to survive in their education, social, and personal worlds and to accommodate and modify their ways to conform to the pressures of globalization. And finally, the educator is expected to accept the technique or the art of plagiarism as it stands today. The act and the meaning of plagiarism have remained the same across history; however, the educator is expected to combat not only the old methods or techniques associated with plagiarism, but also the new techniques introduced with the influence of technology.

Mckenzie (1998) in her article, *Seven Antidotes to Prevent Highway Robbery in an electronic Age*, referred to the "horse & buggy days of plagiarism" and the "space age days of plagiarism" (p. 3). According to Mckenzie (1998), technology has enabled the art of plagiarism to become much more learner-friendly since it required the learner to search, download or cut and paste hundreds of ideas within very little time. That she warned was the new plague in society that had to be fought since society was placing less and less value on the learners' intention to question the value or the originality of work.

It is true that the art of plagiarism has always existed, but, with technology, this art has needed no test of time since it has made the art more efficient.

Learners, in general, when asked, claim that they understand the definition of plagiarism and they know how to avoid plagiarizing their assignments. Thirty learners in a class of English were given an assignment to carry out a research task, using technology as their medium, having been taught the steps to create a term paper. Of the class of thirty, fifty percent of the learners submitted documented research papers, plagiarism-free; thirty five percent of the learners presented papers with minor traces of plagiarism, and fifteen percent of the learners presented incomplete papers. (see visuals)

It is my belief that the solution to fight plagiarism is through a computer assisted language learning medium. Since the literature has noted that with the influence of technology, plagiarism has reached more cost effective heights for learners, I, as an educator, believe in technology's use to control and limit its use in the learners' L2 environment.

Jones (2001) noted that the literature continued to allude to the powerful link that is present between computer assisted learning and L2 pedagogy. That was especially true when it alluded to promoting learner autonomy in the L2 environment. Moreover, it has also been pointed out that the levels of target language proficiency have increased with the use of CALL (computer assisted language learning) since the computer encouraged learner autonomy (Jones, 2001; Sabieh, 1998, 2000f).

It is my second belief that an educator and the learners' roles need to be clearly defined in and out of the education setting, and that the roles need to both be active. Even in learner-centered environments, I believe that the educator's role must remain active. The ELT is seen as a guide and a facilitator and a planner, and, in all, he must be seen to play an active role to ensure the learners' growth as they strive to attain autonomy in their learning. Jones (2001) contended that the use of CALL in a learning situation was dependent on the active role the educator had played in that environment to help the learner assimilate and accomplish.

It is my third belief, and my most important belief, that the course work given by the educator throughout the semester, especially where learning tasks are concerned, must be based on autonomy, cooperation, feedback, motivation and challenge.

The purpose of the paper was to show that the key to combating plagiarism was to provide learners with a challenging assignment using the computer as the medium and giving them autonomy to design the site.

The challenging assignment was to act as the motivator that would enable the educator to combat the learners' plagiarism.

Ngeow (1998) noted that when learners were motivated to transfer the information given, they needed to be able to transfer the content using strategies with the appropriate process needed. She reminded her readers that the research literature implied that transfer and motivation went hand-in-hand to create an effective learning situation. In general, as noted in the literature, learners are able to take the knowledge they possess and transfer it into the new learning environment because they are able to perceive its relevance (Nigeow, 1998; Prawat, 1989; Pea, 1988, Thordike, 1932). Based on this analysis, it follows, then, that it was important that learners feel challenged to learn. That, in turn, motivated them to act.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) discussed motivation in terms of it being instrumental and integrative. Gardner and Tremblay (1994) added to motivation other directional meanings. They believed motivation should direct learners' reasons for learning; likewise, it should direct their desire to attain the outcome, it should be an integrative part of their attitude and perception vis a vis the learning situation, and it should direct their effort to act.

Motivation, then, based on Oxford and Shearin's (1994) analysis of motivational theories, impacted the learning situation and challenged the learners since it had to do with their attitude, their self beliefs, their goals to attain, their degree of involvement, their personal attributes and their environment support.

Thus, it is important to note that the learners' motivation, as Gage and Berliner (1998) pointed out, determines what makes for reinforcement, what accounts for their goal orientation, what determines the amount of time spent on fulfilling the task, and what they achieve. Moreover, the motivation becomes the means to the end and the end itself. In short, that is where the challenge lies for both the educator and the learners.

It was for that reason I chose to use the computer, a tool with the inherent characteristic needed to promote motivation, as my medium to combat plagiarism.

I stressed that the computer was not to be viewed as a substitute for the educator. The computer was to be a medium. It was not to limit the learners' autonomy to learn by being a "tutor" (Alessi & Trollip, 1991; Levy 1997; Taylor, 1980) where the learners wee not the ones who decided on the path of learning.

The learners were to use the computer as an aid in their quest of mental growth. Jones (2001) stressed that it was imperative that learners' carry out their work with little interference and with independence to reach the end product. Even Toyoda (2001), in a research project report, noted that, on a collaborative web page group project, the students worked on their tasks independently throughout the semester yet remained interdependent on each other to attain the goal. Thus, it was important that the learners felt that the environment they were functioning in was computer mediated to serve their needs.

The computer, as the medium, was to be seen, for both the English language teacher and the learners, as a delivery system, as a motivator and a power tool (Sabieh, 1998; 2000b, 2000d, 2001d).

As a delivery system, the computer was the medium that enabled learning growth to take place through the computer. It linked the learners to the learning task. As a motivator, the computer increased the learners' interest in the task driving or motivating the learners to perform and carry out the learning activity. As a power tool, the computer strengthened the demands on the learners' cognitive level since what the technology offered both in context and content was diverse and challenging. As a power tool, the computer also increased the learners' task individualization and promoted active participation with their learning processes.

One of the course objectives I was expected to teach had to do with teaching the learners the basic steps needed to create an APA research paper (syllabus). In fulfilling that course objective, my objective was to ensure that the learners create documented research papers, plagiarism-free, knowing the learners may have tended to take the easy way out.

The solution to combat plagiarism in the course, I believed, was to find a way to keep the learners' on-task, interested and involved in their work. I proposed to fight plagiarism through the use of CALL and to do so, I planned to have the learners follow a five-step plan.

Method

The plan was to have the learners carry out a five steps process to fulfill both the course and my objectives. Some steps in the five-step plan were to be carried out concurrently; some were to follow a certain order. In brief, the steps were as follows: Step one provided the learners with a challenging assignment; step two provided clear research steps to follow; step three provided the way to minimize fear of the technology and the fear of carrying out the assignment: the creation of a term paper and a web page; step four had to do with ensuring that the learners understood the research steps; and step five had to do with ensuring that the learners had acquired plagiarism awareness.

Sample

The learners were 30 first year students enrolled in a class of remedial university English. In the course, the learners were to master skill integration, paragraph and essay writing and term paper writing as part of the university graduation requirements. The learners were students majoring either in science, computer science or engineering. Twenty-five of the thirty were computer literate in that they knew how to use the basic Microsoft programs and the email. Two of the thirty learners knew how to create websites. Five out of the thirty were computer illiterate.

Procedure and Rationale

STEP 1: Provided the challenging assignment

In step one of the plan, I provided the learners with the assignment.

Leland (2002) in his article, *Plagiarism and the Web*, recommended a number of suggestions for teachers to consider when planning for students write research papers. He, as did many practitioners (eg. Harris, 2002....), suggested that the more specific the assignment was, the harder it would be to plagiarize; the more interesting the subject matter was; the less likely the learners would choose an alternate pathways to travel on. Moreover, the more process oriented the work became, the less likely the learners would be to venture away from the expected; the more involved the educator was in providing the learners with feedback on their work through out the task, the more likely they were to become involved in the task.

Furthermore, Harris (2002) suggested providing the learners with a meta-cognitive exercise to prove that the work submitted coincided with their thinking and belonged to them. McKenzie (1998) suggested that the learners do more than just gathering basic information on a topic. Along the same line of thought, educators, such as Gagne (1998) and Bloom (1956), stressed on the importance of learners to be given challenging research topics that entailed not only exposing the material, but also expected them to carry out exploration, problem solving and decision making. As such, Nigeow (1998) stressed that it was important that the task provided for the learners promoted intentional cognition. She noted that learners would then be able to recognize the significance of the project since they would feel the possession of the task, transferring to it the different learning skills and knowledge to complete it.

In planning the assignment for the learners, I ensured that the task would include application and internalization of the basic research steps they learnt in the course, meta-cognitive skill application, autonomy and plagiarism awareness. I planned to fight plagiarism through out the course semester and not at the end when evaluating and assessing the final product. My purpose was to combat the learners' urge to plagiarize and to ensure internalization of the correct research process.

In short, I believed that no matter what the assignment was, it was essential that the educator provided the learners with an assignment that promoted feelings of authenticity and ownership in their work. Moreover, the assignment had to provide them with an organized plan of work, indicating dates for deadlines and feedback

In brief, the learners were expected at the end of the course to present to me a documented APA term paper, accompanied by a web page of their creation on a topic of

their choice. I provided the learners with the general assignment, with the break down of the assignment and the conditions to follow.

The learners were given the following instructions:

The assignment was divided up into three parts for clarity purposes:

Part One:

You are to apply the steps covered in Heineman and Willis' *Writing Term Paper* to **write** a documented **research paper** using the APA format on a topic of your choice. This is due the week before the end of the semester.

Part Two:

Along with that, you will be expected to **create a web page** on the topic to include your paper, your resources and any visuals on the topic. This is to be used at the end of the semester when you **orally** present your topic to me and to the class.

I **do not expect** your web page to be sophisticated or complex since this is primarily a class of English, first and foremost. I will provide you with basic guidelines to follow from Lowe's (1999) *Creating Web Pages for Dummies: Quick Reference*, and you may be able to use any web page editors available on Microsoft Internet Explorer or Netscape Navigator. I do not expect you to learn HTML (hypertext mark up language) to complete this assignment. I do not expect that you publish your web page. I repeat this is a class of English.

If you do not know how to use a computer, the Internet or the technology, please see me as soon as possible so that **I can help you** become familiar with what you will need to carry out the assignment.

Conditions to make note of:

1. Material that is to be put on the page must be related to the topic, must be documented, and must be grammatical written in proper English. Language other than English may be put on the site if it is to be used as source material in the term paper.

2. Material must be shown to me to ensure that there is unity of thought and coherence maintained through out the endeavor.

3. Material that is to be used as part of the term paper must be linked to the in-text documentation and to the reference page documentation. Moreover, the link to the in-text documentation should open to the original source to show a highlight of the material used.

Part Three:

The steps and the deadlines to be met by you are as follows. Please make sure that you turn in the work on time to ensure receiving a point for meeting the due dates and to ensure that you are keeping up the pace of the overall plan of work. **Feedback, cooperation and brainstorming with me or your peers, especially those learners that are computer literate are all essential parts of ensuring that your work is creative, autonomous and unique as should be to do a research report**

Week one: General topic & Preliminary outline

Week two: Narrowed topic & the start of a working bibliography; create site and start to put material on it

Week three: update on the preliminary outline

Week four: APA documentation of source material. & note-taking

Week five: Note-taking and In text documentation

Week six: Formal outline & ensure documentation on site correct

Week seven: Draft and documentation
Week eight: final touches of paper and site
Week nine onward: presentation of paper and web site orally

The learners were each given a copy of the assignment, along with my email in case they needed to get in touch with me when we were not at the university.

STEP 2: Provided clear steps to follow

The second step in my over plan of five had to do with my class lectures to teach the learners the research steps and the concept of plagiarism.

Using Heineman & Willis' *Writing term Paper*, I taught the learners about the difference between a research and critical paper. I taught them how to choose a topic of interest and narrow it down to a five to seven page term paper. I taught them the difference between primary and secondary sources, and where to find material for their research projects. I taught them about preliminary reading, creating a preliminary outline and a working bibliography. I taught them how to note take, how to document in-text and at the end on a reference page. I taught them the various note-taking methods (summary, quotation, paraphrasing and personal comments). I taught them about plagiarism and how to avoid it. I taught them how to transfer their notes and make it a draft. I taught them how to edit their work and how to format the paper.

I spent time with the learners when teaching them about plagiarism. Ehrlich (2000) in his article, *Avoiding Plagiarism: Mastering the Art of Scholarship*, defined plagiarism simply as "using another's work without giving credit. You must put others' words in quotation marks and cite your source(s) and must give citations when using others' ideas, even if those ideas are paraphrased in your own words" (p. 2).

He went on to use Spatt (1983, p. 438) to further explain "work". Work, accordingly, includes "original ideas, strategies, and research,". Moreover, he notes that work also relates to "art, graphics, computer programs, music, other creative expression used in writing, charts, pictures, graphs, diagrams, data, websites, or other communication or recording media, and may include 'sentences, phrases, and innovative terminology,' formatting, or other representations" (Ehrlich, 2000, p. 2).

For Ehrlich, "source" included "any published books, magazines, newspapers, websites, plays, movies, photos, paintings, and textbooks, and unpublished class lectures or notes, handouts, speeches, other students' papers, or material from a research service" (Ehrlich, 2000, p.2) He noted that it was important that learners understood that any material taken form a sourse must be documentated or else it would be considered as plagiarised.

Heineman & Willis (1988) noted that documentation of the work must be cited intext and on a refence page. While working with the learners on understanding the definition of plagiarism, I worked with them to ensure correct note-taking steps. I needed to ensure that material being summarized was not just taking key words and putting them together or that paraphrasing was taking words or lines and just changing their order. Or when they quoted they did so because they could not figure out how to use the statement. I also worked with them to documents in-text appropriately in the draft stage of the paper. I worked with them to clarify the application of correct note taking and documentation, minimizing their need to resort to plagiarism. I did not want to face what Howard labeled

as plagiarism categories. For her, plagiarism is categorized into three units: cheating, non-attribution aand patchworking. She talked about cheating as taking others work and declaring it their own; she talked about non-attribution as not acknowledging the souce or the work and patchworking as taking bits and pieces of works and modifying them a bit and using the material in their papers. That was not to be the case with my learners if they had followed what I had taught during the class session.

STEP 3: Minimized fear of computer and of creating the web page

The next step that I had to plan for was to ensure the element of fear was eliminated from the whole task related learning process. Acknowledging that there is fear associated with any use of technology in general, set about educating the learners and giving them plenty of hands-on opportunities to do both with me in my office or in class. To overcome fear of computer use in a setting, one should educate and provide plenty of hands-on practice. In this way, the users will realize how user friendly the technology can be providing them with an understanding how the computer can become a partner and aid in their endeavor to learn (Sabieh, 2000a, 2000c, 2001b).

Once the learners were aware of the computer as an aid, it helped them to overcome the fear associated with the creation of the web page. The more familiar they became with the computer; the more user friendly they classified it to be.

STEP 4: Ensured understanding of research steps

Step four was accomplished concurrently as I presented the learners with the assignment and when each learning unit within the overall term paper writing process was being taught. In carrying out the objective of step four, I ensured that the learners received plenty of hands-on experience and I brainstormed and gave them feedback on each phase they accomplished.

STEP 5: Ensured plagiarism awareness

Step five was to ensure that the learners understood the concept of plagiarism. The most powerful strategy to combat plagiarism I believed was in education. By making the learners able to apply the steps to carry out a research project, the learners were receiving conscious reinforcement of their acts that they internalized to use as a self-evaluative to judge their ability to carry out a task, free of plagiarism.

I provided my learners with the definition of plagiarism and the clearly defined statement of course policy towards plagiarism. The policy as it appeared in the syllabus was stated as "... Any suspicion of plagiarism will result in an 'F' for the entire course". That was the policy on the syllabus; that was the policy of the department.

That made them aware of the consequences of the act. Whether the material was copied intentionally, done without documentation in-text &/or full citation, whether it was done carelessly or done through cutting and pasting material off the Internet, it was still considered to be stealing. With the stated policy being supplied to the learners, the consequences of getting caught was clearly outlines and part of the conscious undertaking of the act.

Ehrlich (2000) suggested that by making the learners aware of what plagiarism was and how to avoid it ensured that their claimed ignorance would not excuse them for

the violation. He argued that whether done intentionally or not, it still violated the act of honesty.

Also, Harris (2002) advanced a very important strategy to ensure strategy awareness. He suggested that the educator discuss the advantages of documenting the source material. He noted that learners did "not seems to realize that whenever they site a source, they are strengthening their writing" (p. 4). In other words, he believed that if learners saw the value citations had to their work, they would consciously avoid plagiarizing since the citations would be to their benefit in fulfilling their goal to perform. Harris suggested that it reflected they were thinkers, that they had positions, that they had strengthened their position and supported their arguments while still preserving the value of what was not theirs.

That was what my intention was in drawing up the five-step plan for the learners' to follow. As a consequence of my effort, I was able to combat plagiarism that semester more so than I had been able to do in previous semesters. What was even more surprising about the endeavor was that the percentage of papers, free or partially free of plagiarism, was significant sufficient enough to utter that, in my fifteen years of teaching, the learners plagiarized less than other learners had done in the previous semesters.

Results and Discussion

By having the learners follow my suggested five-step plan, an educator may be able to consciously combat plagiarism. Thus, I advocate this five-step process with the belief that any educator in a course will be able to combat plagiarism if and only if he takes on an active role in the endeavor through out the need time frame to accomplish the objective.

There is no doubt that in a learner centered environment, the learners are actively involved in the planning and decision making of their learning, but it is important that the educator still occupies the role of planner and, in as much, plans the overall process of learning taking into consideration the learners needs and strengths. Moreover, with the available technology perceived by the educator as a partner to help in the endeavor of teaching and learning (Sabieh, 2002), the role the educator takes on becomes more demanding and active on his part since the computer and the learner are part of the overall triangular relation.

Renard (2000) noted that the role of the educator must change to accommodate the use of technology in the medium. The educator must become a more active member in the educational society involving himself more and more with the students as a guide or facilitator to ensure the process is respected along the way of acquisition.

This would result in clear role definitions for the learners, the educator and the computer. This was the case in the five-step plan. Here, all the roles played an active part in the communicative learning environment. This rationale remains consistent with my past research and results. Once more, I continue to reinforce the use of computer in a teaching/learning environment as a partner to help mainstream learners, learners who are high or average or low achievers, and learners with diverse needs (eg. Sabieh, 2000e, 2000f) under an extremely innovate and unique framework.

Moreover, what I believe is even more essential to consider is that learners achieve the goals or the objectives when they face any of their learning activities if, and

only if, they feel their needs are being met, if they are driven and motivated, if they are actively involved, are reinforced and are given feedback on their work, and if they form habits and learning patterns in the educational environment (Sabieh, 1998). It is up to the educator to ensure that the teaching/learning environment provides this. I was able to accomplish and I can say it was an assignment worth undertaking.

With computer assistance, the educator's new role becomes even more active. The teaching/learning environment becomes even more diversified. The educator is also expected to stimulate, motivate, organize and mediate all that takes place between the computer and the learners. It is true that the educator becomes the facilitator of instruction and the resource consultant, but he too is the one to encourage and support the learners in their learning quest using the computer as the medium. The educator is the one who decides on the purpose of computer use, the learning environment, the methodology, the task and the assessment. (Crook, 1996; Malone, 1993l; Sabieh, 1998).

In the present case, I provided the learners with the overall plan of work and ensured that from time to time the learners communicated with me for consultancy, feedback, approval, aid, brainstorming, advise, task queries and project facilitation. I, as the educator, kept my power position clearly defined, yet, at the same time, transformed the learners into powerful "lords and ladies" responsible for their own learning and for their own completion of the task. It became their role to determine how active a part they were to play in accomplishing the endeavor. They worked at their own pace in the non-threatening environment with no cultural barriers; however, they did so within the set deadline times. Most of them felt motivated and challenged to apply themselves to meet and accomplish their own learning needs.

Based on the results of the project, this proved to be significant in that only five out of the thirty learners (that is 15% of the learners) chose not to submit a term paper or attempt to create a web site. They made no effort to carry out the assignment; meet the deadlines set, brainstorm or discuss their work with the educator. They took on a passive role and when asked by the educator to submit material or come to the office to discuss the term paper, they disappeared. It was not that they were lazy students; it was just that they could not be bothered not only with the project but with all the requirements for the course.

In general, the rationale given by the 35% of learners (10) who had submitted their papers with minor traces of plagiarism was that they had either not planned their work in an organized manner or they had found out they could not create the web site and/or the documented paper within the small time frame left. Three of the learners that had submitted partially completed assignments were learners who had already felt they knew how to do a web page. And, as a result, they had devoted their time and energy solely to designing a more advanced, compared to the other learners, web page, ignoring the learning language assignment part of the project.

The learners that did accomplish plagiarism free papers were 50%. They had integrated the steps of research writing and had taken the time to assimilate and create the web sites. Basically, these were the learners that constantly visited me in my office for brainstorming, consultancy, and feedback on the task Ninety percent of them (13 learners) had claimed to be able to follow the instruction provided for them. Most of the group would come with different pages designed using the suggested tutors for advice on which page or tutor to use. They would bring in not only the one design, but also two or

three designs for the pages to brainstorm with. There were times, when I needed to tell them to rethink the purpose of the project. Moreover, I could feel, through their work and discussions that they had let their motivation and need to overcome the challenge take priority over the task of writing a documented research paper. 75% of them (11 learners) had even taken the initiative to learn the HTML. They had found out that it was easier for them to manipulate and use HTML to do what they wanted on the page; they said that they had felt that the tutors were too limiting for what they had intended to do.

In short, what resulted was a great learning experience. With the give and take, and the receiving of immediate feedback and reinforcements on their work, the learners would modify, correct errors and mistakes, and enhance the mastery. The learners imitated, explored, created, and developed the needed skills for fulfilling the task. The role of the computer provided them with the role of a partner to assist them in their learning endeavor. It helped them in acquiring the skills needed to search for material related to their topic of choice and it helped them to create the web page to expose the topic of their choice. The computer helped them promote their self-concept and their self-esteem, and it strengthened their confidence in the endeavor to produce a work that showed application of their language acquisition even if they did not all submit the final product plagiarism free. It is my belief that they became conscious of the meaning plagiarism and they attempted, to the best of their ability, to control it.

Also, I, in my new role, was the one who controlled how my students' learning was enhanced through computer assistance. It can be said that it is important for the educator to become aware that he is the agent of change in the educational system. I was the one who consciously took on the task to enhance the learning through the teaching environment and through the use of the new partner—the computer.

I recommend that if the educator wants to combat plagiarism realistically he must acknowledge his role as a redefined type of active educator. He must become actively involved in the process as the learners are undertaking to do research. He must provide the learners with feedback and guidance continuously, yet he must still allow then to be autonomous and free to express their ideas within an overall learning framework. Diversity should be at the center of the educator's mind-frame to accept learner individuality and learner ownership as the learners venture in their quest for knowledge. Emphatically, I highly recommend that in courses where learners are expected to do research that educators endeavor to integrate the technology into the assignment as more than a tool to type out the material to submit to the educator. That is so often the case. It does not give the computer its power to become what it may be--the powerful partner to both the educator and the learners. I believe that in fulfilling my objective to combat plagiarism, I was able to exemplify the superior use of the compute in that way.

In conclusion, the educator in creating a challenging assignment uses the technology as a partner to create plagiarism awareness, and the learners use the technology as an aid to consciously eliminate plagiarism in the language learning process.

References

Alessi, Stephen M. and Stanley R. Trollip. (1991). *Computer Based Instruction: Methods and Development.* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Ehrlich, H. (2000, Mar. 20). *Avoiding Plagiarism: Mastering the Art of Scholarship.* ehrlich@andromeda.rutgers.edu.

Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1998). *Educational Psychology.* 6th edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Gagne, R. M. (1985). *The Conditions Of Learning And Theory Of Instruction.* 4th ed. Fort Worth. TX: Holt. Rinehart and Winston.

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning.* Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.

Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 359-368.

Harris, R. (2002, March 2). *Anti-Plagiarism Strategies for Research Papers.* Virtual Salt Home. www.virtualsalt.com

Heineman, A. & Willis, H. (1988). *Writing Term Papers.* 3rd ed. Orlando, Fla.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Hinchliffe, L. (1998, May). *Cut-and-paste plagiarism: Preventing, detecting and tracking online plagiarism.* janicke@alexia.lis.uiuc.edu

Jones, J.. (2001, June) CALL and the teacher's role in promoting learner autonomy. *CALL-EJ Online*, 3 (1).

Leland, B. H. (2002). *Plagiarism and the Web* www.wiu.edu/users/mfbhl/wiu/plagiarism.htm

Levy, M. (1997). *Computer-Assisted Language Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowe, Doug. (1999). *Creating Web Pages for Dummies: Quick Reference.* 2nd ed. Foster City, CA: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.

Mckenzie, J. (1998). Seven Antidotes to Prevent Highway Robbery in an electronic age. From Now On: *The Educational Technology Journal.* 7 (8).

Nigeow, K. Y. (1998). *Motivation and transfer in language learning.* ERIC Clearing house on Reading English and Communication. ERIC Digest. (ED # 427318)

Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.

Pea, R. D. (1988). Putting knowledge to use. In Raymond S. Nickerson & Phillip R. Zodhiates (Eds.), *Technology in Education: Looking Toward 2020.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Prawat, R. S. (1989). Promoting access to knowledge, strategy and disposition in students: A research synthesis. *Review of Educationsl Research*, 59, 1-41.

Renard, L. (1999 Dec./2000 Jan.). Cut and paste 101: plagiarism and the net. *Educational Leadership.* 57 (4). www.New-Teacher.com

Sabieh, C. (1998). *The Use Of The Computer As A Tool And/Or Tutor To Enhance Language Learning.* PhD Dissertation, Université du Saint-Esprit Kaslik., Lebanon. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Sabieh, C. (2000a, November). *An improved English language education system with computer assistance.* Paper presented at the English Regional Conference on Language and Change, Lebanese American University, Beirut, Lebanon. (in press)

Sabieh, C. (2000b). Computer assistance: The solution to enhance learning. In A. Al-Riyani (Ed.), *The Non-Governmental Higher Education Conference: Vol. 3, Non-Governmental Higher Education and the Futuristic Horizons.* Sana'a, Yemen: Queen Arwa University Press, 183-206.

Sabieh, C. (2000c, May) *Computers in education: Is fear the problem?* Paper presented at the *Practical Teaching ideas for a New Millennium* SPELT TIE-IN, Damascus, Syria

Sabieh, C. (2000d). Just a Computer? *International Conference on Technology in Mathematics Education* (pp. 140-145). Beirut, Lebanon: Lebanese American University and UNESCO

Sabieh, C. (2000e, Nov.). *Reform or Chaos: A Question of Ignorance in a World ofTechnological Advances.* Paper presented at the Conference in School Based Reform in Arab Countries, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon. (in press)

Sabieh, C. (2000f) The psychology of learning and the use of the computer: A practical solution. In H. E. Klein (Ed.), *Creative International Teaching: Case Method and Other Techniques* (pp. 231-245). Boston: WACRA ERIC Digest. (ED # 451135)

Sabieh, C. (2001a) A Confident Arab Scholar: Faculty Development and Technology. In *Proceedings of the Use of Information Technology in higher Education in Arab Universities Conference* (pp.11-20). Beirut, Lebanon: Notre Dame University Press.

Sabieh, C. (2001b). Administration, Technology and Building the Educational Environment: Together With Technology, *We* Build Students. In Adnan El Amine (Ed.) *Educational Administration in the Arab Countries* (pp. 189-207). Beirut, Lebanon: The Lebanese Association for Educational Studies.

Sabieh, C. (2001c). The Cloud Around Development And Exploiting Call Material. In Keith Cameron (Ed.), C.A.L.L.–The Challenge of Change: Research & Practice (pp.15-20). Exeter: Elm Bank Publications.

Sabieh, C. (2001d). *Computers in English Language Teaching: Why Not Use Them?* Paper presented at NELTA's Eighth International Conference in Kathmandu, Nepal. (in press).

Sabieh, C. (2002, Jan. 4). *World of Computer: A Partner to Learning Theories and Conditions*. Paper presented at the Millennial Lecture Series, Notre Dame University, Lebanon. (to be published)

Spatt, B. (1983). *Writing from Sources* NY: St. Martins Press.

Taylor, R., ed. (1980). *The Computer in School: Tutor, Tool. & Tutee*. New York: Teacher College Press.

Thordike, E. L. (1932). *The Fundamentals of Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Toyoda, E. (2001). Exercise of learner autonomy in project-oriented CALL. *CALL-EJ Online*, 2(2).